

addition to losing anticipated funding for this year, are facing enormous difficulties in planning for the next. Technical assistance and consultation to hundreds of small- and medium-sized cultural institutions will be suspended.

The drastic effects of government shutdown and budget impasse on American scholarship and the entire humanities field is not necessarily as obvious as it is in other areas of concentration. This is because NEH grants, with their heavy emphasis on research, rarely see results for several years. But continuity in support for research projects is critical, and NEH represents the single largest source of financial support for the humanities nationwide. The next largest, the Andrew Mellon Foundation, provides one-third of the amounts granted by NEH.

When we eliminate the staff and resources funded by NEH and needed to preserve brittle books, the destruction does not stop. We have lost volumes of important manuscripts forever. The same is true for NEH's important United States Newspaper Preservation project to preserve city and small town newspapers on communities in all 50 States.

Mr. President, I cannot underestimate the gravity of this situation. If allowed to continue, it will mean that future generations of Americans will be deprived of the knowledge of our Nation's rich history. We owe it to our people to maintain this legacy, and not to let it slip away. We simply cannot afford to lose artifacts, texts, wisdom, and insights that tell where we came from, who we are, and how we might make wise decisions for the generations ahead. I urge my colleagues to consider how very serious this situation is, to understand the long-term ramifications of cuts in the NEH budget, and to join in a bipartisan effort to enable this agency to continue its good, worthwhile, and extremely important endeavors.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT OF 1996

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1541) to extend, reform, and improve agricultural commodity, trade, conservation, and other programs and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Craig (for Leahy/Lugar) Amendment No. 3184, in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3184

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, we will soon have a cloture vote on the Leahy substitute to Senate bill 1541, The Freedom To Farm Act, I introduced. We had a cloture vote on that legislation the other day, gaining 53 votes, a majority of the Senate but less than the 60 required to end debate on that occasion.

My colleague, Senator LEAHY, former chairman of the committee, a man with whom I have worked in the Senate from the time that I started on the Agriculture Committee, has made a number of constructive suggestions. The latest version we are about to vote on is the Freedom To Farm Act but with additional suggestions made by Senator LEAHY in the form of a substitute. And I support those additions, Mr. President.

I wish to simply recite a few of them for the benefit of Senators who are following this debate. Senator LEAHY has said, why not take this occasion to let producers bid for a permanent easement in the Wetlands Reserve Program as opposed to bidding for a shorter period of time. I think that is a very constructive suggestion. He has asked that we encourage innovative range management techniques to be developed in the Southwest under grazing lands authorization. He suggested to make it possible for farmers to serve on State technical committees. So that is incorporated in the legislation.

A very significant change, Mr. President, is the reauthorization of the Food Stamp Program and other nutrition programs that require authorization at this time in order to continue.

Senator LEAHY, furthermore, has made an important change by suggesting that we reauthorize the Conservation Reserve Program through the year 2002, allowing new signups and making water quality a high priority, that which we have considered at length in our committee with extensive hearings and many witnesses strongly in favor of continuation of the program and of the priority for high water quality, likewise for trying to save soils that are in a high erosion situation, and, of course, the preservation of wildlife, supported by conservationists and sportsmen throughout the country.

Senator LEAHY has asked that we create a nonprofit foundation to promote conservation, a conservation foundation. This idea has passed the Senate earlier in previous legislation.

An especially important program, Mr. President, which will now be a part of this legislation, is the EQIP program, \$100 million per year in additional mandatory funding for crop-oriented conservation cost sharing, similar to the Lugar-Leahy conservation bill, S. 854.

Let me simply say, these are suggestions that would have come forward in other titles of the farm bill. We all appreciate the situation in which the

farm bill was incorporated in the Balanced Budget Act. Regrettably, President Clinton vetoed that act and he, therefore, vetoed the farm bill.

As I explained to Members the other day, literally I picked up the farm bill from the side of the road and put it back into play, and we got 53 votes to stop debate on that situation. We are hopeful of getting 60 votes to end debate by incorporating these additional suggestions of the distinguished Democratic leader of the Agriculture Committee. I will add that many other Members on the other side of the aisle have shown strong support for Senator LEAHY's initiative.

Mr. President, other speakers today have mentioned the importance of certainty about farm legislation. Clearly, that is the reason we return today. We are attempting to provide that certainty so that farmers will know there is a program that has passed one body and have a fairly good idea how that meshes with the farm bill that is now about to be considered on the floor of the House of Representatives, a bill very similar in terms of all of its freedom to farm aspects.

I predict if we are successful today, we will be in a position to confer with the House very promptly upon their return, and farmers will have an idea, at least in framework, of what to anticipate as they try to order inputs prior to planting.

If we fail to act, two things will occur, one of which has been predicted by Secretary of Agriculture, Dan Glickman, and that is, he feels a mandate to begin thinking through the allotments for rice, and he will have to begin thinking about payments to certain wheat farmers—who were in the business in 1949—as the Texas wheat crop is harvest in the latter part of May. Those events are coming along the calendar.

The other thing that will clearly occur is that many farmers will simply adopt their own freedom to farm idea. They will plant for the market. They will abandon Government programs. I have suggested that may not be a totally bad idea. It might be, in fact, revolutionary if farmers simply took their fate in their own hands and say we are going to plant for the market and not wait around for games to be played on the Senate floor, for parliamentary procedural difficulties.

For those who want certainty and those who want a farm program, this is the day and this is the hour at 4:10. If we make progress, I predict we will have a sound program that has a safety net and certainty. If we do not have cloture today, I suggest to farmers all over America, you better begin thinking about taking your fate in your own hands because I do not predict success very soon along the trail.

I note on the floor, Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont. Therefore, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. If I can just take a couple minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LUGAR. I yield the majority leader as much time as he might require.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, first, I thank the distinguished chairman of our committee for his effort and also Senator LEAHY from Vermont, the ranking minority member of the committee.

As I have indicated in the past, farm bills are always difficult to pass. They are even more difficult than the House side. I hope today we can demonstrate in a bipartisan way we want to move forward, try to get this to conference. I think American farmers want and deserve certainty, and I assume, as the chairman just indicated, maybe if we do not do anything, they will just do it on their own.

It is interesting today, the Governors are in town and this morning, by unanimous vote, they passed a resolution calling for us to pass a farm bill without delay no later than February 15. These are Democrats and Republicans, but they were unanimous. Nearly every Governor has someone or many or hundreds or thousands of people in their State who rely on agriculture for a living, and they understand the importance of agriculture.

President Clinton also spoke this morning with the Republican and Democratic Governors. He said we ought to strike while the iron is hot. Well, the iron is hot. This is the time to strike because there is not any administration farm bill, as far as I know. Somebody even offered a reward if anybody can find an administration farm bill. If they are just against what we are doing and do not have an alternative or if they have an alternative, vote on both, give them a vote, give us a vote, 1-hour debate and we are out of here.

The farmers will have some certainty. We are prepared to do that this afternoon. So the iron is hot and the farmers are hot, and the farmers are getting hotter every day. They do not understand why this is being mired down in a partisan effort to stall to go to conference. We have had 33 hearings. This bill has been endorsed by nearly every major agriculture commodity group. We have had a bumper crop of profarm rhetoric, but we do not have a profarm bill.

Farmers really do not care what we say on the Senate floor. They are not hanging on every word uttered on the Senate floor, but they would like to have some guidance so they know what they can tell their banker, for example, or their employees.

So on behalf of the American farmers, I ask my colleagues to pull the plug on the filibuster, because the choice we face is clear. We will either adopt a policy that fosters the future growth of America's No. 1 industry or we are going to continue a farm policy

that is the equivalent of driving a truck while looking in the rear-view mirror.

U.S. agriculture is dynamic and growing. It is time for Washington to help foster this growth by implementing a simpler and more flexible market-based farm policy.

So I think we have a lot of opportunities to offer amendments if people disagree with the farm bill. There are a couple hundred amendments filed, I understand. So I hope we can adopt a bill that will meet the concerns as we go into the 21st century. I think the future is bright for American agriculture. But we have to be prepared, and part of the preparation is adopting a farm policy that is growth oriented, which means eliminating supply controls, providing farmers with full planting flexibility and a program which is simpler and more certain.

So I hope we will do what we should have done. The President vetoed the bill. That is his right. As far as I know, there is no alternative offered by the President. That is his right. Again, as I said, if there are alternatives, why not just have a vote on each today. Vote on the freedom to farm; vote on the Leahy amendment, whatever. There has been a lot of bipartisanship in putting together the pending substitute.

So I hope my colleagues will understand that it is time for action. It is time to strike, as the President said, while the iron is hot. It may not get any warmer. Sooner or later, we will get cloture, because I think the farmers and farm groups are beginning to contact our colleagues and are persuading our colleagues, for the right reasons, to move forward.

So I urge my colleagues to do what we should have done sometime ago—pass a farm bill. I am from a winter wheat State. At the end of every 5-year farm bill, we never know what the farm program is going to be, and so farmers do what the chairman said. They go out and sort of plant everything and hope that the legislation will let them destroy some of it or continue to produce it. So the time is long past due, and I hope we will take positive action today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont controls 11 minutes of time, and the time under the control of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota wishes to speak. I wish to speak, but, obviously, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota and ask him to make sure that I get a couple of minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the ranking member, the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

I agree with much of what we just heard the majority leader say. He said we should have passed a farm bill a long time ago. I agree. He said we should strike while the iron is hot. I agree. He said that we need bipartisanship. I agree. He said the farmers are

clamoring for us to get something done. I agree.

The leader did not explain why it is that we have not been able to pass a piece of farm legislation in the Senate Agriculture Committee. He did not explain why we have not had this bill pending before us, as we have every 5 years for the last 60 years. He did not indicate, as I know he understands, that we have never sent a bill to President Clinton as a freestanding piece of farm legislation.

Everyone knows the history here, and everyone knows that this legislation was incorporated—a better word is “buried”—in the budget reconciliation bill. That is where the legislation was, and that is what the President vetoed.

So we are here this afternoon with the prospect of voting on a farm bill that has not been subject to one amendment, has not been subject to one day of debate. We would be locking into law, if cloture is invoked, legislation that would eliminate permanent farm law for the first time in 60 years, that would do things about which most Senators today still are not completely appreciative. Why? Because we have not had a debate.

I agree, as I said, with the leader that now is the time to get the job done. But if we are truly going to get the job done, why is it that we would take an all-or-nothing attitude? We had an opportunity to pass a compromise. I felt very encouraged in the last several days as we worked with the distinguished Chair. He is as forthcoming and as willing to work with us as any chairman. I applaud him for his efforts. We worked with the majority leader's staff, and with staff on our side, in the expectation that we could break this impasse. I think we were within reach, within grasp of achieving a meaningful compromise. Why, for some reason, there was a change of heart on the other side of the aisle, I do not know. All I know is that we missed that opportunity to bring a compromise to the floor, to have a good vote, to work through this piece of legislation with an expectation that we could finish by the end of the day tomorrow. I still would like to see us do that.

Let us do, for Heaven's sake, what we have always done on a piece of legislation this controversial and this far-reaching. Let us consider important amendments, and let us deal with this debate in a way that will allow us to make the very best decisions. Let us not take the all-or-nothing attitude that is expressed by some on the other side. Let us not ignore the consequences of ending permanent law.

All we are asking is an opportunity to offer amendments, not to be precluded from offering them. The majority has a lot of rights around here, but one right should not be to preclude the minority from making what they consider to be very important improvements in this legislation. We want the rights that we have fought for every day we have come to the Senate floor.

I must say, Mr. President, that nothing is more important than that. Put aside for a moment the issue of farming and all of the serious policy implications of the current farm proposal; put those aside. Just remember how critical it is that Senators have the right to offer amendments and not be impeded by the parliamentary process that could be put in place under cloture. I do not want that to happen on this bill, or on any piece of legislation, for which there has been no debate or amendments.

There may come a time when we are going to have to invoke cloture—when I would support it. But not today, not under the circumstances, and not without having a good debate and, certainly, not with the expectation that this ultimately will go nowhere.

A justified Presidential veto of this legislation would put us right back where we started. We do not want that; farmers do not want that. Let us work through this and get a compromise that will allow us a meaningful opportunity to come together, and I will predict passage by an overwhelming vote, certainly by the end of the day tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes, 27 seconds.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my time, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia be given 1 minute under his own control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wish we were not in the situation we are in. I would like to see a farm bill done in the normal course. In 1990, when we did the Leahy-Lugar farm bill, it was a comprehensive package that blended the needs and interests of urban and rural America with the need to maintain and reclaim our environmental heritage as well as to provide the food and fiber needed in this country.

We seem to be operating under a different situation. I hope that the final package we have here will have a bipartisan nature to it. The other body determined that they cannot do that. I believe we are different in this body, and I believe that we can. We have always approached farm legislation that way, and this is no different.

As I approached the farm bill year, I asked myself the following question, and it is a question that I believe every Member in this body needs to ask him or herself.

What is a farm bill?

In 1996, a farm bill is no longer just about farm programs. It is not just about growing crops or amber waves of grain.

The farm bill is about feeding the American people. It is about the elimination of hunger in one of the wealthiest nations in the world.

The farm bill ensures that children do not go to bed hungry—at home and abroad.

Congress created the world's most cost-efficient and effective nutrition programs.

These programs are the lifeline for millions of Americans—especially children in need of Government assistance.

Except for the 26 million Americans on food stamps, most Americans do not realize that food stamps are America's best and largest child nutrition program.

Most Americans are not aware that the authority for the food stamp and other nutrition programs expired last year.

Today, we have the opportunity to reauthorize these nutrition programs and maintain this safety net for millions of at-risk Americans.

Quite simply, this is a moral question.

The farm bill is about safety—knowing that the food supply of our children and our children's children is safe.

When our children drink a glass of water, we know it is free of pesticides. When our children buy a school lunch or grab a snack after school, their parents and teachers know it is safe to eat.

The farm bill is about the environment. It is about responsibility to conservation and the legacy we leave to future generations.

I have said twice this year on the Senate floor that the historical basis for the present commodity programs has disappeared.

And, I know that they are important to the 2 to 3 percent of the population that they directly serve. But, these programs, as presently structured make less and less sense to the majority of the population.

There is a real reason that taxpayers should make payments to farmers and ranchers. It is simple and clear justification for commodity programs and Americans understand it.

Farmers and ranchers manage half of the land in the United States. Yes, half of the land in the United States.

Farmers and ranchers, however, need the help of taxpayers to implement innovative, valued environmental solutions to maintain this land.

It is impossible to solve our clean water problems, wetland and wildlife problems except through a positive incentive program that should form the basis of the agricultural program of the next century.

We have accomplished that in this legislation. For the first time there will be incentives to help all farmers and ranchers be the good neighbors that they have always worked to be by allowing them ways to control the agricultural-related pollution that affects our rural and urban communities.

Bottom line, this package will provide a future farm program that will fund conservation-based farm programs that benefit every American and it will help all farmers and ranchers who control pollution and steward sensitive lands—not just those who produce major crops.

It is a good package. Can we do better? Sure, we could, by going through the normal course. The last time we had a 5-year farm bill, it took 7 days—an all-time record. These things sometime take a long time. I wish we could have come to agreement with the proposal the distinguished Senator from Indiana, Senator LUGAR, and I, along with Senator DASCHLE and Senator DOLE, made to our respective caucuses last Thursday. In my mind that was the best of all possible worlds.

That has not been found acceptable. I think that is unfortunate. I think we could have had more enthusiasm and voted for it had that happened. Now we have what we have.

A farm bill should also be responsive to the needs of a region with special circumstances. This farm bill does that by consenting to the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact. The compact is State law in the each of the six New England States and is strongly supported by New England's governors.

The compact is a grassroots effort designed to set fair and stable milk prices that will benefit farmers and consumers. The New England States are not asking for anything but to go forward with this effort. All year we have heard about the need to give more power back to the States. This is an opportunity for Congress to do just that.

Later during this debate there will be an amendment to deal with national dairy policy. It is not perfect but it is a good start, and certain issues will need to be resolved in the House-Senate conference. It eliminates the assessment farmers have to pay for the dairy program, and phases down price supports. It saves \$80 million over 7 years, not bad for a program that cost only \$4 million last year.

This amendment will also protect and reform the Federal milk marketing orders and allow our dairy producers to compete internationally by fully funding the Dairy Export Incentive Program.

#### RESTORATION OF THE FLORIDA EVERGLADES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, included in the farm bill that the Senate will consider today is a provision for \$200 million to be used by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to move forward with restoration of the Everglades ecosystem. Some of my colleagues may wonder why the farm bill contains such a provision, and I would like to take a few minutes to explain the importance of restoring this unique ecosystem.

The Everglades is one of the most unique wetland ecosystems in the world. It is a national treasure that is in peril and deserves the immediate attention of Congress.

Prior to the 1940's the Everglades ecosystem covered most of south Florida, from its headwaters in the Kissimmee River basin to the coral reefs of Florida Bay. Because of man's alterations, the once "river of grass" is now fragmented and deteriorating, threatening not only the wildlife of the

ecosystem, but also the water supplies, economy and quality of life for the people who live in Florida.

The central and south Florida project, authorized by Congress to control flooding and reclaim land in the area, has had unintended and disastrous results. While flood protection in many areas has improved, south Florida's ecosystem has suffered greatly.

On average, more than 500,000 acre feet of water are sent to tide each year from Lake Okeechobee. In addition, another 1 million acre feet from the Everglades agricultural area is discharged to tide each year through east coast canals. This water once remained in the system and was a primary source of fresh water for wildlife and served to replenish the ground water supplies.

Now the water that flows south in the Everglades marshes is diverted by canals and polluted by agricultural runoff, primarily from sugarcane fields. Water entering the Everglades often has 20-30 times the phosphorous levels that are found in unpolluted parts of the Everglades. This has led to an explosion of plants that are dramatically altering the landscape and the habitat of threatened and endangered species. Cattails are overwhelming periphyton, the very base of life in the ecosystem, destroying the unique balance of the Everglades.

Throughout the system, clear, fresh water has been replaced by murky, nutrient laden water that does not support native plant and animal species.

The years of water diversion and pollutants affect not only the Everglades, but also Florida Bay. The Bay is suffering from a lack of fresh water that has led to algal blooms and contributed to the extinction of North America's only native coral reef. As a consequence, this once teeming estuary now is closed to commercial fishing, and the tourism industry of the region is threatened.

We must not let the Everglades die. Although the decline of the ecosystem continues, it is reversible.

Current efforts by Federal, State and local governments to restore the system are moving forward. Restoration will involve not only protection of the natural system, but also continued flood protection and provisions for adequate water supplies for wildlife and humans. This comprehensive effort could be derailed if sufficient acreage in the southern Everglades agricultural area is not acquired to provide storage and delivery of adequate, fresh water supplies to the natural system.

As explained by the Everglades coalition, a diverse group of more than 30 citizens, environmental and conservation organizations, restoration of the Everglades requires a "dike to dike" approach to restore the natural flow of water into the Everglades, preserve and clean up polluted waters, reduce flooding and provide more water to a growing Florida. A "dike to dike" water storage and management area of approximately 230,000 acres in the south-

ern Everglades agricultural area would be used to restore water quality and a more natural hydroperiod in the Everglades. Portions of this land are already state owned, and are available for Everglades restoration purposes. About 130,000 additional acres of land currently used for sugarcane production will need to be acquired in order to complete the necessary water management area.

According to the Everglades coalition, significantly increasing water storage will provide a wide array of benefits to all of south Florida including: The recovery of water now wasted to the ocean; more water for all water users, including the natural Everglades; restoration of the natural timing, distribution and flow into the Everglades; more areas to clean polluted water; the amelioration of flooding; and the protection of the Lake Okeechobee, St. Lucie and Caloosahatchee estuary ecosystems.

This is an ambitious project, which will cost billions of dollars. Today, we are making a small down payment—\$200 million for Everglades restoration.

Specifically, this provision directs the Secretary of the Treasury to provide \$200 million to be used toward the acquisition and modification of approximately 130,000 acres in the Everglades agricultural area identified by the agencies to be used for water storage and delivery. This would include the remaining private acreage in townships 46, 47, and 48 of the Everglades agricultural area, approximately 52,000 acres referred to as the "Talisman Tract" and other restoration activities in the ecosystem. When enacted, no further action by Congress will be necessary to authorize the administration to spend these funds. In addition, the funds shall not be provided for this program from the Conservation Reserve, Wetlands Reserve or any other conservation programs.

This small down payment will be insufficient for total restoration. It is only part of the Federal Government's share of this coordinated restoration effort. More important, it in no way relieves others—particularly the sugarcane industry that has benefited from the alteration of the system and continues to pollute it—of its obligation to contribute to restoration costs.

These growers benefit from the Federal Sugar Program that guarantees them significant earnings. In the next 5 years alone, some 139 Florida sugar producers and processors will make more than \$1 billion in profits because Washington inflates the price of sugar, at the expense of the consumer.

Florida sugar producers must contribute their fair share—a 2-cent per pound assessment on new sugar grown in the Everglades—to pay for both past water quality degradation caused by cane farming, and for land acquisition vital to Everglades restoration. This would raise \$350 million over 5 years.

This proposal has wide spread support in Florida. Poll after poll shows

that voters there believe polluters should pay and favor the 2-cent assessment.

I will pursue every effort until Congress or the voters in Florida impose a 2 cent assessment on every new pound of sugar grown in the Everglades agricultural area.

In addition, today's action should help the Clinton Administration which is taking significant leadership on restoring the Everglades. In a January 11, 1996 directive, Vice President GORE ordered key Cabinet departments to prepare a thorough plan for the President . . . for the restoration of the Everglades and the south Florida ecosystem.

The Vice President wrote that "the Florida sugarcane producing industry must pay their fair share" of restoration costs. He further directed senior administration officials to develop a plan that: "assures that sufficient land now involved in agricultural production is returned to its natural function to allow for storage and purification of water."

I will do all I can to work with the administration in this effort.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text of Vice President GORE's January 11, 1996, directive and administration's guiding principles be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,  
Washington, DC, January 11, 1996.

Memorandum For: Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of Interior,

Dan Glickman, Secretary of Agriculture,  
Carol Browner, Administrator EPA,  
Alice Rivlin, Director OMB,  
Katie McGinty, Chair CBQ,  
Togo West, Secretary of the Army.

From: The Vice President.

Subject: Everglades and South Florida Ecosystem Restoration.

Recently, the President and I again discussed the issue of restoring the Everglades. We both continue to be deeply concerned about the problems there, and believe that the Administration must continue to provide strong leadership and aggressively build on your collective efforts to date to restore and manage wisely the South Florida ecosystem.

During a recent trip to South Florida I pledge to expedite our work. Through this memorandum I am therefore requesting OMB and CBQ to work with the departments and agencies to prepare a thorough plan for the President that builds on our work and the set of principles adopted by the Administration to ensure fairness in funding the restoration of the Everglades and South Florida ecosystem. (A copy of the principles is attached).

This plan should accomplish the following objectives:

Assure that sufficient land now involved in agricultural production is returned to its natural function to allow for storage and purification of water. I understand that a number of scientists have recommended that 100,000 acres or more will be necessary to achieve a thorough restoration. I would like the Army Corps of Engineers to complete, as quickly as possible, its assessment of this acreage and whether additional acreage will be necessary to accomplish this objective;

Ensure a long-term, reliable reverse stream to be put toward land acquisition and other essential activities. Please specifically note continued federal, state, and local government contributions, and economic incentives, and identify and assess mechanisms that can ensure that these responsible for the pollution harming the South Florida ecosystem and those who benefit from the federal flood control and water supply projects, including the Florida sugarcane producing industry, pay their fair share;

Identify those measures that must be undertaken in short order, such as, for example, preserving a buffer around the Everglades and increasing water flows to Florida Bay; and

Expedite and coordinate the various federal efforts now ongoing for ecosystem restoration including the Army Corps of Engineers "restudy".

In developing this plan, please work with our state, local and tribal governmental partners. In addition, I would also ask you to consider all potential sources of revenues for such an effort, and to review any mechanisms including, for example, land trades; sales of surplus federal lands; or conservation easements, for acquisition of the necessary properties or development rights.

Your timely attention to this matter is very much appreciated. The Administration's continued leadership on this matter is vital and I anticipate with great interest your report on the best means for the Administration to assure the future of the precious natural treasure—the Florida Everglades and Florida Bay—and the health and economic prosperity of the citizens of South Florida. Thank you.

FUNDING TAX RESTORATION OF THE  
EVERGLADES, GUIDING PRINCIPLES  
DECEMBER 1995

The restoration and protection of the Everglades and Florida Bay is one of the Clinton Administration's highest environmental priorities. The Everglades is a unique national natural treasure. With Florida Bay, it undergirds the quality of life and the tourism and fishing industries in South Florida.

The substantial costs of restoration over decades should be borne by those who have benefitted from activities that profoundly altered the Everglades ecosystem, and by those who will potentially benefit by its restoration. Florida sugarcane producers should pay their fair share of the costs. Federal State and local governments also should share in the costs of restoration.

Congress should adopt legislation that provides funding to assist in making a substantial down payment on the significant restoration needs that immediately face the Everglades—such as enhancing more natural water deliveries to the Everglades and Florida Bay, acquisition of the Talisman tract, and acquisition and engineering of an East Everglades water preserve buffer zone.

Funding proposals should meet clearly defined objectives and be integrated into technical plans for the overall, long-term effort to restore the South Florida ecosystem. Restoration and funding proposals should be evaluated for their effect on the South Florida ecosystem, rather than on any single component of that ecosystem.

The proposals should be developed and implemented in consultation with State and local communities and officials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I congratulate the leadership for trying to move this bill forward.

My contribution is very short. I have just returned from a wonderful 2-day

visit to the rural areas in my State. I visited yesterday and spoke to the Virginia Association of Corn Growers, the Virginia Association of Soybean Growers. Every one of them said "Where is this bill?"

This morning was the most dramatic. I visited a section of my State, the valley which was ravaged by floods, ice, and snow, together with the Federal Emergency Management Agency. We were there this morning to help farmers. Mr. President, 13 counties and 3 municipalities were severely damaged. One old farmer got up, looked at me, and said, "Senator, we can dig out from under all this ice and snow. Why can you not dig out from the problems of Washington and pass that farm bill?"

I assured him that I would leave instantly to return to Washington to cast a vote to do just that.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators GRAMM of Texas and SNOWE of Maine be added as cosponsors for the Leahy substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, my Democratic colleagues say we need a farm bill. They could not be more correct. The simple solution: vote for the Craig-Leahy substitute amendment.

Last week the Senate voted on the motion to invoke cloture on S. 1541, which contained the agriculture provisions included in the Balanced Budget Act that, unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues opposed and the President vetoed. I am disappointed that the Senate was unsuccessful in limiting debate on this legislation, which would have moved this body one step closer to passing a farm bill.

Today I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to put party politics aside and vote for farm legislation that has the support of both Democrats and Republicans; the Craig/Leahy substitute amendment.

The Craig/Leahy substitute amendment represents a bi-partisan approach to farm legislation; farm legislation that will allow our farmers to farm to the marketplace and not to Washington, D.C. bureaucrats' farm legislation that will provide flexibility, predictability, simplicity, and opportunity for the American farmer; and farm legislation that will give certainly to farmers, their bankers, and to the tax-paying public. Simply put Mr. President, the Craig/Leahy compromise will give U.S. farmers the positive reforms they need in order to respond to the demands of emerging world markets.

Members of both parties have debated the need for a farm bill for nearly ten months. My advice to my colleagues is simple: by supporting the Craig/Leahy compromise today we can have a farm bill that is supported by farmers across the country; a farm bill that provides genuine flexibility and a smooth transition into the market-responsive agriculture of the next century.

The alternative, Mr. President, is the status-quo. That, Mr. President, is simply unacceptable to farmers in my State of Washington and across the country. American farmers deserve better—they deserve a program that will provide certainty and flexibility. It is time to put party politics aside and vote for farm legislation that has support from both sides of the aisle.

Vote for the Craig/Leahy substitute today and give our farmers what they deserve: a farm program will allow them to farm according to the marketplace and stop the Federal government from telling them what crop to plant, when to plant, and how much to plant. Washington does *NOT* know best—these decisions belong to the farmer, not the Federal Government. Voting for the Craig/Leahy compromise, Mr. President, is common sense.

In closing Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter from Washington State Farm Bureau, representing over 6,000 farmers and ranchers in my State, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON STATE FARM BUREAU,  
Olympia, WA, February 5, 1996.

Hon. SLADE GORTON,  
Hart Senate Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GORTON: This letter is being sent on behalf of the 6,000 farmers and ranchers that the Washington State Farm Bureau represents. We are asking your support for a seven-year farm bill.

It is important that you understand that our members are adamantly opposed to a one or two year extension of current law. To do this would exasperate immediate cash flow problems for our farmers. Also, a one or two year extension leaves the long term look very uncertain for our farmers. We are also opposed to reverting back to the Act of 1949. Many problems would result from this approach, especially since the allotments based on the 1950 production patterns are not consistent with where wheat is actually grown today.

Our farmers are trying desperately to plan for this year's crop. Further inaction on behalf of the Senate and the House will only continue to disrupt both financing and planting of their 1996 crop. Farm families can't afford to have Congress continue to stop the process of signing a farm bill into law.

A Farm Bureau analysis shows that we need a farm bill which guarantees \$44 billion in spending on commodity programs. We believe that this spending level reflects a significant contribution to budget deficit reduction by agriculture and is the minimum amount necessary for effective commodity programs.

It is our understanding that there will be a cloture vote on Tuesday, February 6th on the Craig/Leahy substitute bill for S. 1541. We urge you to support S. 1541. Please vote for this compromise farm bill and allow our farmers and ranchers to focus on what they do best, feeding the people of our great country and the world.

Sincerely,

STEVE APPEL,  
President.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, tremendous changes have occurred in the agriculture economy over the last many years.

The growth of biotechnology, new and dramatic genetic research applied at the farm level, new and innovative production techniques, broadened communication and transportation systems, have all contributed to a much different farm and ranch operations today than just a decade ago—let alone half a century ago when New Deal legislation put on the books the farm programs we still have today.

I remind my colleagues when the Commodity Credit Corporation was established in 1933 farm households accounted for 25 percent of the U.S. population and generated over 10 percent of GDP.

Today farm households comprise less than 2 percent of the population and generate less than 2 percent of GDP. I know that the total food and fiber system beyond the farm gate contributes another 10 to 13 percent to GDP.

But those factors that helped create the need for farm price support programs in 1933 no longer apply today.

That is one reason why I am supportive of the concepts of an agriculture market transition program that we included in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

Today an international market has developed for America's farm products and we need to provide the mechanisms that allow farmers to base decisions on market conditions and not on Government programs.

The Market Transition Program moves agriculture in a new direction which will give farmers the freedom to plant what they want, when they want, so that they will be able to compete in our global market environment.

The Market Transition Program also ends the production control programs of the Depression era and provides a market transition for American agriculture.

Under our current system, farmers may be required to take land out of production which allows our foreign competitors to make up the difference in the world markets.

The Balanced Budget Act and the Leahy compromise also provides more flexibility, which farmers have asked for, less paperwork, and a better opportunity for farmers to earn a living from the marketplace.

Mr. President, a group of 15 distinguished economists, including the chief agricultural economist from the Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Carter, Reagan, Bush, and Clinton administrations, have indicated their support for the reforms in the Balanced Budget Act. Those concepts are also incorporated in the Leahy compromise bill.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I support the concept of a spending cap which were included in the Balanced

Budget Act for agriculture and are also included in the bipartisan Leahy compromise.

The spending caps as provided through a market transition program will benefit both the taxpayer and the farmer. The taxpayer will not end up paying for unforeseen spending and the farmer will know what resources he will have in the future.

The Market Transition Program puts a cap on total spending for the wheat, cotton, feed grain, and rice programs at \$35.6 billion over 6 years.

Spending for the Commodity Credit Corporation programs has varied widely from \$0.6 billion in 1975 to \$26 billion in 1986.

The spending cap in the Market Transition Program will limit unforeseen spending increases which have frequently occurred in past years.

It is my hope that the spending restraints included in a market transition program will be retained in the final Senate bill.

Mr. President, some have also said that any spending reductions to agriculture is unacceptable. However, any reductions will provide a downpayment toward a balanced budget.

Mr. President, the Balanced Budget Act made reforms to farm programs, saved \$4.6 billion and allowed the Department of Agriculture to spend \$85.1 billion in outlays over the next 7 years for the commodity, conservation, export, and crop insurance programs.

We also know that modern day agriculture requires significant amounts of operating capital. Farmers will be one of the largest beneficiaries from a balanced budget because interest rates will decrease.

Mr. President, I would also like to remind my colleagues that if the savings diminish we will have to make up the difference elsewhere to achieve a balanced budget.

I cannot end this discussion without talking about agriculture in my home State of New Mexico.

Mr. President, in my home State cattle, calves, and dairy dominate agriculture receipts—70 percent of total cash receipts in New Mexico came from livestock and dairy operations.

In truth, because of the heavy emphasis on livestock and dairy in my State, ranchers and dairy operators have a keen interest in farm bill changes.

Mr. President, I am concerned that none of the bills have been discussed do not include a dairy title.

The New Mexico dairy industry has grown significantly over the past several years. The number of milk cows has increased by 104 percent from 1990 to 1994 compared to a decrease of 5 percent for the United States.

New Mexico has also led the Nation in milk production per cow in 2 of the last 4 years. New Mexico dairy farmers and manufacturers have made substantial investments in one of our fastest growing dairy States.

In fact, New Mexico will have the largest cheese manufacturing plant in

the world once construction is completed.

For these reasons it is my hope that we can enact policies which are fiscally responsible, reduce regulation, reward efficiency, reduce the number of mandates on the industry, and increase the dairy industries ability to compete in the international marketplace.

Mr. President, the House Agriculture Committee has already reported a farm bill which includes a dairy title.

It is my understanding that the bill would consolidate many existing marketing orders to 8 or 13 orders. I believe that is good policy but previous versions of the bill would eliminate all dairy programs if the USDA does not consolidate the orders in 2 years.

This type of policy concerns me because outright elimination could be devastating to the stability of the industry.

In addition, other policy adjustments provided for in the House bill appear to be short-sighted in their approach.

It is my hope that we will take every opportunity to provide as many avenues as possible for our dairy farmers to compete in growing world market.

Looking for long term opportunities for stable and sustained markets is far more important than providing for short-sighted fixes that end up as burdens on both the dairy industry and the taxpayer.

Mr. President, the peanut industry took the initiative early last year to eliminate costs of the program to the taxpayer. The provisions in the Balanced Budget Act and the Leahy compromise do eliminate the cost to the taxpayer—saves \$412 million over the next 7 years.

Mr. President, the Leahy substitute bill includes an amendment regarding peanuts which is very important to my home State of New Mexico.

Mr. President, as part of the 1985 farm bill, Congress adopted a provision which created an exclusive pool for New Mexico Valencia peanuts. The same provision was also retained in the 1990 farm bill.

The original intent of the law is to allow only those Valencia peanuts grown in the State of New Mexico to enter into the New Mexico Valencia pool.

However, peanut growers in my home State have notified me that Valencia peanuts grown out of State have been entering the New Mexico pool. This is being done because of a loophole in existing regulations.

This is an issue that is very important to me because it's importance to eastern New Mexico.

The provision in the bill clarifies that only Valencia peanuts physically grown in the State will be allowed to enter into the pool of the State.

Also, the provision would grandfather those individuals who participated in the New Mexico pool with Valencia peanuts grown out of State during the 1995 crop year.

These individuals are only allowed to enter out of State grown peanuts

equivalent to those entered into the pool during the 1995 crop year.

Some may ask, why is this so important? First, Valencia peanuts fill a unique niche within the peanut market and New Mexico produces the majority of all Valencia peanuts nationwide.

Second, the New Mexico industry uses self-regulation so that all quota and additional peanuts are bought back, keeping the pool profitable and costing the Federal Government very little or nothing at all.

In fact, from 1992 to 1995 the New Mexico pool had positive net receipts of \$3.1 million.

Third, the New Mexico peanut industry contributes economically to the State. The New Mexico peanut commission estimates that the peanut industry has an economic impact of \$55.6 million in Roosevelt County where the majority of the Valencia peanuts are grown.

Mr. President, I am concerned that some on the other side of the aisle have charged that Republicans have delayed writing a farm bill and that the agriculture portions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 were done without hearings.

I would like to say that is simply not the case.

First, the Republican budget included commodity provisions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 but the President vetoed that bill.

The Agriculture Committee held 15 thorough farm bill hearings involving 157 witnesses. The Budget Committee, which I chair, also had two hearings involving the budget aspects of the farm bill.

In fact, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, Mr. LUGAR, and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD, testified before the Budget Committee.

EXHIBIT 1

December 13, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,  
*The President of the United States, Executive  
Office of the President, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In recent statements on the Budget Reconciliation Bill, you cited, among your priorities, the need to ensure the strength of America's farmers. We agree that the health and vitality of America's farm sector is important. The way to ensure this long term vitality is to reform obsolete farm programs, and to adapt farm policy to the new realities of the world market and to farming today.

Reforms in the Reconciliation Conference Report offer significant gains for farmers and the nation. We urge that the substance of these reforms be maintained in the budget negotiations between the White House and Congress. It is right, after 60 years, to end government-imposed acreage controls, to provide farmers the flexibility to make their own planting decisions, to keep price supports at competitive levels, and to limit spending on deficiency payments.

The proposals in Secretary Glickman's "Blue Book" guidance to Congress, together with reductions in deficiency payment acreage that you have since recommended, are steps in the right direction. The further reforms of the Conference Report provide an opportunity to go beyond those improve-

ments in the structure of farm programs to establish a basis for a government role in agriculture that is suitable for the 21st century. The opportunity to do this in a bipartisan way in the current budget negotiations should not be wasted.

We are troubled by proposals from some in the agriculture community to roll back the clock by supporting farm prices above long-term market clearing levels. We strongly support authority for the Secretary to insure from year to year that U.S. farm prices are competitive in world markets. High and rigid price supports will either lose export markets, or will again open up an unlimited and untenable pipeline to the Treasury to finance surplus acquisition and disposal.

The history of the 1980s should convince anyone that setting U.S. price support levels above long-term market clearing levels is terribly unwise. While the outlook for exports is promising, the Secretary needs to be able to respond to changes in market prospects without waiting for the next farm bill.

Advocates of fixed and high price supports argue that marketing loans make such supports workable. Nothing could be further from the truth. Open-ended budget exposure on marketing loans could again lead to exorbitant spending, to the use of acreage controls to limit costs, to lost export markets, and to an eventual public decision to end the farm safety net.

If more money becomes available for farm programs as a result of changes in budget assumptions, we urge you to use it for high priority programs of research, conservation, and rural development, and to ease the transition of commercial farmers to a market-based agricultural policy.

We urge you not to repeat the mistakes of the past that priced U.S. farm products out of world markets, placed farmers in a production strait-jacket, and raised farm program spending to embarrassing and unsustainable levels.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. Willard W. Cochrane, University of Minnesota, Director of Agricultural Economics, USD, Kennedy Administration.

Dr. Lynn Daft, Abel, Daft, Earley & Ward International, Agricultural Counselor, White House, Carter Administration.

Dr. Bruce Gardner, University of Maryland, Assistant Secretary for Economics, USDA, Bush Administration.

Dr. Dale Hathaway, National Center for Food & Agricultural Policy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, Carter Administration.

Dr. Robert Innes, University of Arizona, Council of Economic Advisors, Clinton Administration.

Dr. D. Gale Johnson, University of Chicago.

Dr. William Leshner, Russell and Leshner, Assistant Secretary for Economics, USDA, Reagan Administration.

Dr. Lawrence W. Libby, University of Florida.

Dr. Don Paarlburg, Purdue University, Special Assistant, President Eisenhower Director of Agriculture Economics, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, Nixon-Ford Administrations.

Dr. Robert Paarlburg, Wellesley College and Harvard University.

Dr. C. Ford Runge, University of Minnesota.

Dr. John Schnittker, Schnittker Associates, Under Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, Johnson Administration.

Mr. Daniel A. Sumner, University of California-Davis, Assistant Secretary for Economics, USDA Council of Economic Advisors, Bush Administration.

Dr. Robert L. Thompson, Winrock International, Assistant Secretary for Economics, USDA, Reagan Administration.

Dr. Luther Tweeten, The Ohio State University.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion to invoke cloture on the Farm bill before the Senate today. I encourage my colleagues to support this motion so that the Senate may move to consideration of the merits of the bill. Those who crafted this legislation have been working day and night to put together a package that would allow for the farm legislation to proceed. The legislation offers flexibility, certainty and opportunity for America's farmers.

Mr. President, it is imperative that we enact farm legislation soon. Failure to act this year leaves us with bleak alternatives. Reversion to 1938 and 1949 laws could dramatically increase the cost of running the farm programs. Extending current programs only delays the need to make significant reforms in a 60-year-old farm program.

Hoosier farmers, and farmers across America, need payment assurances and guidance in planting decisions. The compromise legislation would provide fixed payments to program farmers and allow farmers to plant any program crop. The compromise also contains meaningful conservation and nutrition proposals. At the same time, this legislation would work toward reducing Federal spending.

The Senate should not overlook this opportunity to move forward and pass farm legislation. We should not miss the opportunity to initiate change and institute reform in the Nation's farm policies.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the cloture motion on the Leahy-Craig substitute to S. 1541, and in support of the bill.

I am pleased to join my New England colleague, Senator LEAHY, and my friend from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, as a cosponsor of this important bill. As everyone realizes, we must pass new farm legislation as quickly as possible. Farmers in many parts of the country who rely on Federal farm programs are already making planting decisions, and they need some certainty on this matter. But farmers are not the only ones with a stake in the prompt passage of this bill.

If we do not pass farm legislation quickly, policy reverts to agricultural laws dating to 1949 and 1938. And under these statutes, the cost of our farm programs could skyrocket, adding up to \$10 or \$12 billion in additional costs to the Treasury in 1996. Obviously, given the continuing fiscal crisis that we have in the Federal Government, and given the year-long struggle to pass a 7-year balanced budget plan, we cannot allow that to happen. In fact, our fiscal reality dictates that we make significant additional reductions in current farm spending authorized under the 1990 farm bill, and the Leahy-Craig substitute will generate these additional savings from the present baseline.

Mr. President, although the great majority of Maine farmers do not depend on or even use Federal commodity



programs, the Leahy-Craig substitute contains a couple of provisions of great importance to Maine farmers. First, the substitute retains a provision that was included in S. 1541 which preserves the existing restriction on planting fruits and vegetables on what we previously called flex acres. Both the Leahy-Craig substitute and S. 1541 refer to all program acres as contract acres, but we still had a problem in earlier versions of S. 1541 whereby commodity crop farmers would have been able to grow any crop on unpaid contract acreage.

This was a problem because it would place nonprogram fruit and vegetable growers at a distinct disadvantage in competition with program farmers who grow the same fruit and vegetable crops. The disadvantage arises from the fact that farmers who grow a program crop like wheat, along with a vegetable like potatoes, can use the Government support payments for wheat to bolster their potato business. Potato farmers in Maine, on the other hand, who do not grow any program crops, do not have a guaranteed source of revenues that they can rely on to support their farm operations.

Senator LUGAR, the author of S. 1541, and Senators LEAHY and CRAIG have listened very intently to the concerns of full-time fruit and vegetable farmers, and they addressed this matter with an even hand. Senator LUGAR even met with Maine potato farmers to discuss this problem. The substitute prohibits the planting of most fruits and vegetables, including potatoes, on contract acres. Senators LUGAR, LEAHY, and CRAIG have demonstrated considerable leadership on this issue, and they deserve to be commended for it.

The other provision in the substitute that I would like to specifically mention concerns dairy farming. Section 108 provides the consent of the Congress to the Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact. This compact was drafted, negotiated, and signed between all of the New England States to help remedy a serious problem throughout that region: the rapid loss of the family dairy farm.

The compact creates a regional commission which has the authority to set minimum prices paid to farmers for fluid, or class I milk. Delegations from each State comprise the voting membership of the commission, and these delegations in turn will include both farmer and consumer representatives. The minimum price established by the commission is the Federal market order price plus a small "over-order" differential that would be paid by milk processing plants in the region. This over-order price is capped in the compact, and a two-thirds voting majority of the commission is required before any over-order price can be instituted.

Mr. President, we desperately need this dairy compact in New England. The current Federal order price for this region does not come close to reflecting the farmers' cost of production. As

a result, we are losing family farms at a consistent and rapid rate, and their loss impacts the rural economy and the municipal tax bases of many small New England towns.

The people of New England—farmers, consumers, processors, and public officials—devised the compact as a solution to this problem, and it is wisely limited in scope. The compact only applies to class I fluid milk, and since we have a largely self-contained fluid milk market in our region, the compact will not harm farmers or processors in other regions of the country. There is no good reason not to support the efforts of the people of New England to solve one of their own problems. We should praise them for their ingenuity and self-reliance. I am very pleased that Senators LEAHY and CRAIG have recognized the merits of this proposal, and have agreed to include it in their substitute.

Mr. President, the Leahy-Craig substitute will generate substantial savings for the taxpayers, and it will give farmers more flexibility. It will address the concerns of many fruit and vegetable growers, and dairy farmers. Given the fiscal implications of not passing a farm bill, all Senators have an important stake in at least the completion of debate on the farm bill. Senators LEAHY, CRAIG, LUGAR, DOLE, and many others have done a tremendous amount of work of the substitute before us, and the Senate must be allowed to finish action on it. I urge my colleagues to vote for cloture and for passage of the Leahy-Craig substitute.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Leahy substitute farm bill.

The Leahy substitute farm bill, is at its core, essentially the freedom-to-farm bill. The provisions contained in the Leahy substitute were never debated in committee, were not passed as part of the Senate budget reconciliation bill, but were instead approved in conference.

I have some strong reservations regarding the freedom-to-farm bill, although I too, share the concerns of each Member of this body that farmers need immediate certainty. The farmers in Alabama experienced a disastrous year in 1995 with a drought, insect infestations and even a hurricane or two. These farmers have suffered a great deal and the payments in freedom to farm appear very attractive. However, the guaranteed payments freedom to farm offers are made in exchange for a phaseout of farm programs. I disagree strongly with phasing out farm programs.

The efforts undertaken by the Department of Agriculture to address the disastrous crop year and subsequent financial hardship provides another option for American agriculture. The USDA has announced its intention to allow for extended repayment of advance deficiency payments, with the interest waived in some cases. This effort should be applauded. I also think

that the discussion regarding the forgiveness of 1995 advance deficiency payments warrant some merit. I believe that we can provide income stability for our farmers without demanding the phaseout of farm programs in return.

The core component of sound farm policy should be an adequate and certain safety net, one that provides support when market prices are low, and one that does not need to make payments when the market is up. This is how current farm programs are structured, and they work.

I have long stated that I believe that the current structure of farm programs have served rural America, and consumers everywhere, extremely well. Therefore, it is my belief that farm programs should only be fine tuned. I do recognize that some of my less fortunate regional colleagues feel that farm programs that affect their States need greater changes than those that affect the South. The ability to resolve these differences is the purpose of debate on farm programs. Which to this point has been very little in committee, where farm programs are supposed to be written. Therefore, I recommend that we return to committee and discuss the farm bill as we always have in the past. We would then be able to bring a bill to the floor that addresses all of our needs and concerns, and pass a bill that serves our agricultural producers, rural America and consumers alike.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the substitute amendment to S. 1541, the farm bill.

LARRY E. CRAIG, JAMES M. JEFFORDS, DON NICKLES, JOHN H. CHAFEE, ROBERT F. BENNETT, THAD COCHRAN, TED STEVENS, TRENT LOTT, RICHARD G. LUGAR, CRAIG THOMAS, ALAN K. SIMPSON, JOHN W. WARNER, LARRY PRESSLER, DAN COATS, CONNIE MACK, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the substitute amendment numbered 1384 to Senate bill 1541, the farm bill, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DOLE. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MURKOWSKI], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] and the